

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	10/594,306		MILANI COMPARETTI ET AL.		
	Examiner		Art Unit		
	MICHAEL SIMITOSKI		2439		

All Participants:

(1) MICHAEL SIMITOSKI.

(2) David Longo.

Date of Interview: 27 June 2011

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

39, 76, 77

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Michael J Simitoski/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2439

Status of Application: after final

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 1 p.m.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted Applicant to discuss several claims. Claim 39 contained a potential lack of antecedent basis with "wherein said step of detecting information on application layer protocols". Further, a potential indefiniteness issue arose from claim 76's "associated therewith". Lastly, the Examiner proposed to Applicant that claim 77 may be construed as not further limiting and thus an improper dependent claim. All of the above issues were resolved in the attached, agreed-upon Examiner amendment.